UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN RE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICE LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL CLASS ACTIONS

MDL No. 1456

CIVIL ACTION: 01-CV-12257-PBS

Judge Patti B. Saris

PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL COMPLIANCE WITH CMO NO. 7 AGAINST DEFENDANTS ABBOTT, DEY, PHARMACIA, SHERING-PLOUGH AND WARRICK

On August 15, 2003 the Court issued CMO No. 7 that provided in part as follows:

- II. Allowed Discovery Pending Decision on Motions to Dismiss
- 1. Plaintiffs shall conduct discovery on claims set forth against a defendant named in the MCC that was not dismissed as to both Class 1 and Class 2 claims. The specific drugs subject to discovery are those identified in the defendant-specific allegations of the MCC if the MCC identified a specific plaintiff who purchased the drug. There shall be no discovery on multi-source drugs.
- 3. All non-dismissed defendants are directed to supplement their document productions under the order of this Court dated October 28, 2002 (relating to production of documents produced to governmental bodies concerning AWP matters) by producing all documents produced by a non-dismissed defendant in response to recent subpoenas issued by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, or any other governmental body, by making such documents available to counsel for the plaintiffs for inspection and photocopying within 30 days. (Emphasis added.)

Defendants Abbott, Dey, Pharmacia, Schering-Plough and Warrick received a letter from the U.S. House Committee on Energy and Commerce on June 26, 2003 requesting the production of documents relating to AWP issues. See News Release from the Committee on Energy and Commerce attached hereto as Exhibit A.

These Defendants were not dismissed from Class 2 of the Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint (the "MCC"). *See In re Pharmaceutical Industry Average Wholesale Price Litigation*, 263 F. Supp. 172, 195 (D. Mass. 2003).

These Defendants have not complied with CMO No. 7 that requires production to Plaintiffs of documents produced to the House Energy and Commerce Committee by non-dismissed Defendants. Instead each of these Defendants has taken the position that as manufacturers of multisource drugs they were dismissed from the MCC. *See* correspondence from Defendants attached hereto as Exhibit B. Plaintiffs believe that Section II, ¶3 of CMO 7 applies to Defendants not "dismissed as to both Class 1 and Class 2 claims." None of these Defendants were dismissed from both Classes of the MCC, hence ¶ 3 of CMO No. 7 applies despite the fact that elsewhere, discovery on multi-source drugs is not permitted by CMO No. 7.

Plaintiffs hereby request that the Court enter an Order requiring each of Defendants Abbott, Dey, Pharmacia, Schering-Plough and Warrick comply with CMO No. 7 and supplement their production to Plaintiffs accordingly. Plaintiffs have filed herewith a Proposed Order for the Court's consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas M. Sobol (BBO # 471770) Edward Notargiacomo (BBO #567636)

Hagens Berman LLP

225 Franklin Street, 26th Floor

Boston, MA 02110

Telephone: (617) 482-3700 Facsimile: (617) 482-3003

LIAISON COUNSEL

Steve W. Berman Sean R. Matt Hagens Berman LLP 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone: (206) 623-7292 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594

Samuel Heins Brian Williams Heins, Mills & Olson, P.C. 700 Northstar East 608 Second Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: (612) 338-4605 Facsimile: (612) 338-4692

Jeff Kodroff John Macoretta Spector, Roseman & Kodroff, P.C. 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103 Telephone: (215) 496-0300 Facsimile: (215) 496-6611

CHAIRS OF LEAD COUNSEL COMMITTEE

Marc H. Edelson Alan Hoffman Hoffman & Edelson 45 West Court Street Doylestown, PA 18901 Telephone: (215) 230-8043 Facsimile: (215) 230-8735

DATED: September 17, 2003

Kenneth A. Wexler Elizabeth Fegan Hartweg The Wexler Firm One North LaSalle Street, Suite 2000 Chicago, IL 60602 Telephone: (312) 346-2222 Facsimile: (312) 346-0022

MEMBERS OF LEAD COUNSEL COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Michael McShane Alexander, Hawes & Audet, LLP 300 Montgomery Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 982-1886 Facsimile: (415) 576-1776

Robert E. Piper, Jr. Piper & Associates 624 Pierre Avenue Shreveport, LA 71103 Telephone: (318) 226-0826 Facsimile: (318) 424-9900

MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Anthony Bolognese Bolognese & Associates One Penn Center 1617 JFK Boulevard, Suite 650 Philadelphia, PA 19103 Tel: (215) 814-6750 Fax: (215) 814-6764

Jonathan W. Cuneo The Cuneo Law Group 317 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20002 Tel: (202) 789-3960 Fax: (202) 789-1813

Neal Goldstein (Of Counsel) Freedman & Lorry, PC 400 Market Street, Suit 900 Philadelphia, PA 19106 Tel: (215) 925-8400 Fax: (215) 925-7516

- 4 -

Michael E. Criden Hanzman & Criden, PA Commerce Bank Center, Suite 400 220 Alhambra Circle Coral Gables, FL 33134 Tel: (305) 357-9000 Fax: (305) 357-9050

Blake M. Harper Kirk B. Hulett Hulett Harper LLP 550 West C Street, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 338-1133 Fax: (619) 338-1139

Jonathan D. Karmel Karmel & Gilden 221 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1414 Chicago, IL 60601 Tel: (312) 641-2910 Fax: (312) 641-0781

G. Mark Albright Albright, Stoddard, Warnick & Albright Quail Park 1, Building D-4 801 South Rancho Drive Las Vegas, NV 89106

Dianne M. Nast Roda & Nast, PC 801 Estelle Drive Lancaster, PA 17601 Tel: 717-892-3000 Fax: 717-892-1200

Henry H. Rossbacher Rossbacher & Associates 811 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1650 Los Angeles, CA 90017-2666 Tel: (213) 895-6500 Fax: (213) 895-6161

Jonathan Shub Sheller, Ludwig & Badey, P.C. 1528 Walnut Street, 3rd fl Philadelphia, PA 19102 Tel: (215) 790-7300 Fax: (215) 546-0942

- 5 -

Scott R. Shepherd Shepherd & Finkleman, LLC 117 Gayley Street, Suite 200 Media, PA 19063 Tel: (610) 891-9880

Fax: (610) 891-9883

Lee Squitieri Squitieri & Fearon 521 Fifth Avenue, 26th floor New York, NY 10175 Tel: (646) 487-3049 Fax: (646) 487-3095

Lisa J. Rodriguez Ira Neil Richards Trujillo Rodriguez& Richards, LLC The Penthouse 226 West Rittenhouse Square Philadelphia, PA 19103 Tel: (215) 731-9004 Fax: (215) 731-9044

Mitchell A. Toups Weller, Green, Toups & Terrell, L.L.P. 2615 Calder Street, Suite 400 P.O. Box 350 Beaumont, TX 77704 Tel: (409) 838-0101 Fax: 409-838-6780

Damon Young Lance Lee Young, Pickett & Lee 4122 Texas Boulevard P.O. Box 1897 Texarkana, AR/TX 75504 Tel: (903) 794-1303

Fax: 903-792-5098; 903-794-5098

ADDITIONAL ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I, Edward Notargiacomo, an attorney, caused true and correct copies of the foregoing Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Motion To Compel Compliance With CMO No. 7 Against Defendants Abbott, Dey, Pharmacia, Shering-Plough and Warrick to be served on all counsel of record electronically, pursuant to Section D of Case Management Order No. 2., this 17th day of September, 2003.

Edward Notargiacomo, Esq. HAGENS BERMAN LLP 225 Franklin Street, 26th floor

Boston, MA 02110 (617) 482-3700

Committee Correspondence

The Committee on Energy and Commerce W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, Chairman

Tauzin, Greenwood Expand Medicaid Fraud Investigation

WASHINGTON (June 26) - As part of an expanded investigation into Medicaid fraud, House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Billy Tauzin (R-LA) and Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman James Greenwood (R-PA) today sent letters to the following 26 drug companies:

Alpharma, Fort Lee, NJ. Apotex, Weston, Ontario, Canada: Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Bridgewater, NJ; Barr Labs, Pomona, NY: Bristol Myers, New York, NY: Dev. Napa Valley, CA: Ethex. St. Louis, MO; Eli Lilly, Indianapolis, IN; Geneva, Princeton, NJ; GlaxoSmithKline, Philadelphia, PA: IVAX, Miami, FL; Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, NJ; Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Morgantown, WV; Par Pharmaceuticals, Spring Valley, NY; Pfizer, New York, NY; Pharmacia, sub of Pfizer, New York, NY; Purdue Pharma, Stamford, CT; Purepac, Elizabeth, NJ; Roche, Nutley, NJ; Roxane, Columbus, OH; Schering-Plough, Kenilworth, NJ; TEVA, North Wales, PA; UD Labs, Rockford, IL: Warrick Pharmaceuticals, sub of Schering-Plough, Kenilworth, NJ; and Watson, Carona, CA.

Below is the test of the letter.

Abbott Labs, Abbott Park, IL;

June 26, 2003

The Committee on Energy and Commerce is conducting an investigation into pharmaceutical reimbursements and rebates under Medicaid. This inquiry builds upon the earlier work by this Committee on the relationship between the drug pricing practices of certain pharmaceutical companies and reimbursement rates under the Medicare program. In that investigation, the Committee uncovered significant discrepancies between what some pharmaceutical companies charged providers for certain drugs and what Medicare then reimbursed those providers for dispensing those drugs. This price difference resulted in profit incentives for providers to use the drugs of specific companies as well as higher costs to the Medicare system and the patients it serves. For example, we learned that one manufacturer sold a chemotherapy drug to a health care provider for \$7.50, when the reported price for Medicare was \$740. The taxpayer therefore reimbursed the doctor almost \$600 for dispensing the drug and the cancer patient had a \$148 co-payment. Such practices are unacceptable in the view of the Committee, which is why we are in the process of moving legislation to address these abuses.

The Committee has similar concerns regarding drug prices in Medicaid, which has a substantially larger pharmaceutical benefit than Medicare. For this Medicaid investigation, we have chosen to review pricing and other aspects relating to

certain drugs produced by your company, along with a fairly large group of other drugs and manufacturers, based upon several indicia from a number of sources, including utilization data, drug price/reimbursement spreads, and other relevant information.

In order for this Committee to effectively and efficiently conduct this review, we are requesting that, pursuant to Rules X and XI of the U.S. House of Representatives, you provide the Committee with the following records and information by July 11, 2003. For the purposes of these requests, please observe the following definitions: "subject drugs" means: acyclovir, amikacin sulfate, furosemide, gentamicin sulfate, paclitaxel, tobramycin sulfate, and vancomycin, in all dosages, strengths or volumes, and regardless of any packaging, labeling or identifiers; "purchaser" means any wholesaler, distributor, retailer, provider, doctor, hospital, pharmacy, health maintenance organization, or any other such entity that obtains the subject drugs at any cost, including free of charge; "spread" means the difference between the cost of the drug to the purchaser and the reimbursement amount the purchaser may receive from any State's Medicaid program, including, but not limited to, (1) the difference between the cost or price to the purchaser and the actual or anticipated Medicaid reimbursement or, (2) the difference between the cost or price to the purchaser and any price or cost submitted, or caused to be submitted by the drug's manufacturer, to any State, Federal agency or Medical Economics Red Book, First Data Bank or Medi-Span or any other such entity that gathers and publishes drug cost or pricing data, such as "average wholesale price," or "wholesale acquisition cost"; and "net revenue" means revenue received from the sale of subject drugs after subtracting any discounts, rebates, charge-backs or any other such price concession, paid by you to any purchaser.

Further, for the purposes of responding to these requests, where providing records or information, please separate and distinguish such records or information, to the extent possible, by each applicable National Drug Code ("NDC") and Healthcare Common Procedural Coding System code. Also, for the purposes of responding to these requests, please do not produce any specific patient medical information. Finally, please note that these requests are directed to your company and any and all related corporate entities that may have responsive documents or information, including, but not limited to, any parents, subsidiaries, partnerships, or joint ventures.

- 1. For the period beginning January 1, 1998, and for each subsequent calendar quarter, and with respect to each of the subject drugs, please provide the following information using the format of the chart below:
 - a. the total volume of sales, indicating both the number of units and net revenue;
 - b. the "average wholesale price" (AWP), as reported in Medical Economics Red Book, First Data Bank and/or Medi-Span, and the volume of sales (in both units and net revenue) occurring (i) at or within five percent of AWP, whether higher or lower, (ii) at more than five percent above AWP, and (iii) at more than five percent below AWP;
 - c. the "average manufacturer price" (AMP), as reported to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, pursuant to the requirements of Social Security Act ("SSA") §1927(b)(3), and the volume of sales (in both units and net revenue) occurring (i) at AMP and up to and including 10 percent above AMP, and at below AMP but less than or equal to 10 percent below AMP (broken out separately), (ii) at greater than 10 percent above AMP but less than or equal to 20 percent above AMP, and at greater than 10 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 30 percent above AMP, and at greater than 20 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 30 percent above AMP, and at greater than 20 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 40 percent above AMP, and at greater than 30 percent above AMP but less than or equal to 40 percent below AMP (broken out separately), and (v) at greater than 40 percent above AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP, and at greater than 40 percent below AMP but less than or equal to 50 percent above AMP.
 - d. the "wholesale acquisition cost" (WAC), as reported by Medical Economics Red Book, First Data Bank and/or Medi-Span or any other such entity that gathers and publishes "wholesale acquisition costs," and the volume of sales (in both units and net revenue) occurring (i) at or within five percent of WAC, whether higher or lower, (ii) at more than five percent above WAC, and (iii) at more than five percent below WAC;
 - e. the "best price," as reported to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, pursuant to the requirements of SSA §1927(b)(3), and the volume of sales (in both units and net revenue) occurring (i) at or within five percent of the best price, whether higher or lower, (ii) at more than five percent above best price, and (iii) at more than five percent below best price (if applicable);

- f. the total volume of sales, in both the number of units and net revenue, exempted from the calculation of the Medicaid best price as "merely nominal in amount," pursuant to the requirements of SSA §1927(c)(1)(C)(ii)(III);
- g. the average price of the "nominal" sales, referenced in subsection (f), above; and
- h. the total volume of the subject drug, in units, distributed as free goods.

NDC And J- Code	Quarter	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
	1Q98 2Q98 3Q98 etc.	Total volume of sales	AWP	AWO	WAC	Best Price	Total volume of sales at "nominal price"	Avg. price of sales at "nominal" price	Total volume of subject drug distributed as free goods.

- 2. For the period beginning January 1, 1998, and for each subsequent calendar quarter, and with respect to each of the subject drugs, please provide the following information:
- a. a. the total volume of the subject drug, in units and net revenue, distributed under state Medicaid programs;
- b. b. the average per unit rebate issued for the subject drug; and
- c. c. the total amount of rebates, in dollars, issued to state Medicaid programs with respect to the subject drug.
- 3. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, please provide all records relating to any perceived or actual failure of any State to seek or achieve full rebates for the subject drugs dispensed under its state Medicaid system.
- 4. For the period beginning January 1, 1998, to the present, has the distribution, marketing, sales or promotion of any subject drug considered, incorporated, or been based upon, in any way, the spread? If so, please describe the circumstances of such distribution, marketing, sales or promotion, and provide all records relating thereto.
- 5. For the period beginning January 1, 1998, to the present, please provide all records relating to the spread on the subject drugs.
- 6. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, please provide all records relating to comparisons between the spread of any subject drug and the spread of any generic or therapeutically equivalent product.
- 7. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, please provide all records relating to the distribution, marketing, sales or promotion of any subject drug at prices exempted from the calculation of the Medicaid "best price," pursuant to the requirements of SSA §1927(c)(1)(C)(ii)(III), including, but not limited to, distribution, marketing, sales or promotion of the subject drug at "nominal price" or otherwise as free product, free goods, or at no cost.
- 8. 8. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, please state for each calendar quarter the largest single purchaser, in terms of units, of each of the subject drugs and the following:
 - a. a. the total number of units of the subject drug received by that purchaser; and
 - b. b. the total net revenue received for the subject drug by your company from that purchaser.

Please also provide the contract or agreement governing your relationship with that purchaser for each relevant quarter.

- 9. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, and for each subject drug, please provide a list of all purchasers who received the subject drug at a price exempted from the calculation of the Medicaid "best price," pursuant to the requirements of SSA §1927(c)(1)(C)(ii)(III), and, for each such purchaser, indicate the volume of the subject drugs received by calendar quarter, in units, and the range of prices at which such purchaser received the subject drug for that quarter.
- 10. Please state the date of expiration for any patents on the subject drugs.
- 11. Please describe how you define, interpret and/or calculate "prices that are merely nominal in amount," as set forth

in SSA §1927(c)(1)(C)(ii)(III).

- 12. With respect to each subject drug, please describe how you calculate the prices and/or data reported to Medical Economics Red Book, First Data Bank or Medi-Span or any other such entity that gathers and publishes either "average wholesale prices" or "wholesale acquisition costs."
- 13. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, please provide all records relating to the "average wholesale price" or "wholesale acquisition cost" of any subject drug that was submitted to Medical Economics Red Book, First Data Bank or Medi-Span or any other such entity that gathers and publishes "average wholesale prices" and/or "wholesale acquisition costs."
- 14. For the period of January 1, 1998, to the present, please provide all records relating to any proposed, considered or implemented change in the "average wholesale price" or "wholesale acquisition cost" of any subject drug.

Please note that, for the purpose of responding to the above requests, the terms "records" and "relating" should be interpreted in accordance with the attachment to this letter. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Mark Paoletta, Chief Counsel for Oversight and Investigations, at (202) 225-2927.

Sincerely,

W.J. "Billy" Tauzin Chairman

James C. Greenwood Chairman Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

cc: The Honorable John D. Dingell, Ranking Member The Honorable Peter Deutsch, Ranking Member Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

- 1. The term "records" is to be construed in the broadest sense and shall mean any written or graphic material, however produced or reproduced, of any kind or description, consisting of the original and any non-identical copy (whether different from the original because of notes made on or attached to such copy or otherwise) and drafts and both sides thereof, whether printed or recorded electronically or magnetically or stored in any type of data bank, including, but not limited to, the following: correspondence, memoranda, records, summaries of personal conversations or interviews, minutes or records of meetings or conferences, opinions or reports of consultants, projections, statistical statements, drafts, contracts, agreements, purchase orders, invoices, confirmations, telegraphs, telexes, agendas, books, notes, pamphlets, periodicals, reports, studies, evaluations, opinions, logs, diaries, desk calendars, appointment books, tape recordings, video recordings, e-mails, voice mails, computer tapes, or other computer stored matter, magnetic tapes, microfilm, microfiche, punch cards, all other records kept by electronic, photographic, or mechanical means, charts, photographs, notebooks, drawings, plans, inter-office communications, intra-office and intra-departmental communications, transcripts, checks and canceled checks, bank statements, ledgers, books, records or statements of accounts, and papers and things similar to any of the foregoing, however denominated.
- 2. The terms "relating," "relate," or "regarding" as to any given subject means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, identifies, deals with, or is in any manner whatsoever pertinent to that subject, including but not limited to records concerning the preparation of other records.

Related Document

Health

Oversight and Investigation

Print Version: Commissee1001E0vrgy250 CommenceNewenRstease F062609007/03 Page 13 of 17 Page 5 of 5

The Committee on Energy and Commerce 2125 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC 20515 (202) 225-2927 Feedback

http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/Letters/06262003 1001print.htm

9/17/2003



JONES DAY

51 LOUISIANA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2113

TELEPHONE: 202-879-3939 . FACSIMILE: 202-626-1700

writer's direct NUMBER: 202/879-3734 christophercook@jonesday.com

September 13, 2003

VIA VERILAW

Steve W. Berman Hagens Berman LLP 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101

Re: In re Average Wholesale Pricing Litigation, MDL No. 1456

Dear Mr. Berman:

We represent Abbott Laboratories. I write in response to your letter of September 10, 2003 regarding production of documents pursuant to paragraph 3 of case management order number 7. As you are aware, the Court's May 14, 2003 Order dismissed all claims asserted by your clients against Abbott. Accordingly, Abbott is a dismissed defendant with respect to the Master Consolidated Complaint and is not obligated to produce documents to you under paragraph 3 of case management order number 7.

Yours very truly,

Robert Christopher Cook

cc: All Counsel of Record (via Verilaw)

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

IOI PARK AVENUE

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10178

(212) 808-7800

FACSIMILE

(212) 808-7897 www.kelleydrye.com

DIRECT LINE: (212) 808-7726

SERVED

EMAIL: probben@kelleydrye.com

WASHINGTON, DC

TYSONS CORNER, VA

LOS ANGELES. CA

CHICAGO, IL STAMFORD, CT

PARSIPPANY, NJ

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

HONG KONG

AFFILIATE OFFICES BANGKOK, THAILAND JAKARTA, INDONESIA MUMBAI, INDIA TOKYO, JAPAN

September 15, 2003

VIA FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

Steve W. Berman, Esq. Hagens Berman LLP 1301 Fifth Ave., Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101

Re:

In re Pharmaceutical Indus. Average Wholesale Price Litig.,

MDL No. 1456 (D. Mass.)

Dear Mr. Berman:

This firm represents defendant Dey, Inc. ("Dey"). I have your letter dated September 10, 2003, regarding section II.3 of Case Management Order No. 7. In response to your September 10 letter, I refer you to my letter to you, dated August 22, 2003, which addresses the issues you raise. A copy my August 22 letter is attached.

PDR:nas

All Counsel of Record (Via Verilaw) cc:

NY01/ROBBP/863620.1



KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

101 PARK AVENUE

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10178

FACSIMILE (2)2) 808-7897

. www.kelleydrye.com

DIRECT LINE: (212) 808-7726
EMAIL: probben@kellaydrye.com

WASHINGTON, DC

TYSONS CORNER, VA

LOS ANGELES, CA

CHICAGO, IL

STAMFORD, CT

PARSIPPANY, NJ

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

HONG KONG

AFFILIATE OFFICES
BANGKOK, THAILAND
JAKARTA, INDONESIA
MUMBAI, INDIA
TOKYO, JAPAN

August 22, 2003

VIA FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

Steve W. Berman, Esq. Hagens Berman LLP 1301 Fifth Ave., Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101

Re:

In re Pharmaceutical Indus. Average Wholesale Price Litig.,

MDL No. 1456 (D. Mass.)

Dear Mr. Berman:

This firm represents defendant Dey, Inc. ("Dey"). I have your letter addressed to Scott Wise, dated August 11, 2003, regarding discovery in this action and write in response thereto.

Your August 11 letter contends that, pursuant to Section II.3 of CMO No. 7, Dey is required to produce "discovery consisting of material produced in response to the House Energy and Commerce Committee or any governmental agency within thirty days." This interpretation of CMO No. 7 is erroneous. Dey will not be producing the referenced documents.

Section II.3 of CMO No. 7 is expressly limited to "non-dismissed defendants". This category does not include Dey, which was fully dismissed from this action on May 13, 2003. See In re Pharmaceutical Indus. Average Wholesale Price Litig., 263 F. Supp.2d 172, 195 (D. Mass. 2003) ("I allow the motion to dismiss all multi-source generic drugs from the complaint..."). As you are aware—and your August 11 letter and attached chart implicitly concede—all of the Dey drugs at issue in the MCC were multiple-source drugs. As such, Dey was dismissed by the May 13, 2003, order, and Dey is not obligated to produce any of the documents set forth in Section II.3 of CMO No. 7.

Very truly yours,

Philip D. Robben

PDR:nas

cc: All Counsel of Record (Via Verilaw)

NY01/ROBBP/859589.1